

REMARKS

Reconsideration and removal of the grounds for rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 21-40 were in the application, claims 21, 25 and 27 have been amended, claim 22 has been cancelled and claims 35-40 were withdrawn.

The examiner objected to the drawings as failing to show the handle of claims 24 and 25. However, this is described in the specification, Page 10, Lines 3-5 as being the inflection 52a; "The inflection (52a) extends circumferentially about the outer surface 24a and serves as a handle for gripping the grinder ring 18a." This is best seen in Fig. 11. Consequently, no further drawing amendment is believed required.

The examiner rejected claim 25 as lacking proper antecedent basis, and claim 25 was amended to correct this deficiency.

Claims 21-23, 26 and 27 were rejected as being anticipated by Mariutti. To have anticipation, each and every element of the claim must be found in a single prior art reference W.L. Gore & Assoc. V. Garlock, Inc. 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Further the reference must describe the claimed invention sufficiently to place a person of ordinary skill in the art in possession of the invention, In re Spada, 15 USPQ 2d (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Claims 21 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 22 therein. Amended claim 21 thus requires relative dimensions between the grinder ring, boss and bowl such that the ring contacts the side wall of the boss to effect the pulverizing action, without the ring contacting the side wall of the bowl.

This is an important distinction. The prior art relies on the grinding action between

“the grinding disk and the annular wall of the grinding barrel body.” Col. 1, L. 34-36, and the cited patent shows quite clearly in Fig. 3, that the disk 34 engages the grinding disk body 22. The raised surface portion 38 of the bottom wall 26 does not restrain movement of the grinding disk, and consequently the grinding disk contacts the side wall of the bowl.

On the other hand, the boss of applicants claim 21 engages the grinding ring so as to leave a space between the grinding ring and the side wall of the bowl so that the side wall is not subject to high wear rates. This is illustrated in Figs. 3-9, 19 and 20 of the application.

As each and every element of the claim is not found in Mariutti, claims 21, 23, 26 and 27 are not anticipated thereby.

Claim 24, 25, 28-34 were rejected as being obvious over Mariutti. However, claim 22 was not so rejected, and the incorporation of the limitations of claims 22 in claim 21 renders moot the rejection. In any event, there is no teaching, suggestion or inference in Mariutti for utilizing a boss and grinding ring as discussed above where the ring is prevented from contacting the side wall of the bowl. Rather, the contrary is true, as Maruitti teaches such contact in the discussed grinding device.

Based on the above amendment and remarks, favorable consideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. However should the examiner believe that direct contact with the applicant's attorney would advance the prosecution of the application, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.



Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William J. Sapone".

William J. Sapone
Registration No. 32,518
Attorney for Applicant(s)

COLEMAN SUDOL SAPONE P.C.

714 Colorado Avenue
Bridgeport CT 06605
Phone: (203) 366-3560
Fax: (203) 335-6779

RECEIVED
JUL 13 2004
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700